

University of Rhode Island DigitalCommons@URI

Berman, Ronald: Humanities Chairman
Nomination Hearing (1975-1976)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts and
Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996)

2016

Berman, Ronald: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (1975-1976): Memorandum 01

Livingston Biddle

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_9

Recommended Citation

Biddle, Livingston, "Berman, Ronald: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (1975-1976): Memorandum 01" (2016). *Berman, Ronald: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (1975-1976)*. Paper 19.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_9/19

This Memorandum is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Berman, Ronald: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (1975-1976) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

Memorandum to Senator Pell

From: Livingston Biddle, Staff Director, Senate Special
Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities

The material below relates to a letter which I am very reliably informed was signed by Ronald Berman, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, and sent to academic leaders in recent weeks. Both sources remarked that the letter appeared to be in the nature of a form letter. The text which was reported to me appears to be identical in the cases involved.

With the letter went a number of newspaper articles and columns including columns Dr. Berman has said express views from which he wishes to disassociate himself.

The letter says that enclosed is publicity regarding the "Pell affair" and an accurate case book thereof.

Then follows this phrasing or substantially this phrasing, precisely taken from my notes:

"Implicit is the attempted politicization of the agency.

Pell objects to the professional use of Endowment funds. He prefers that NEH funds go to ~~general academic purposes~~ state bureaucracies and then be disseminated to grocers and lumberjacks to enable them to practice(?) the Humanities."

The letter concludes by saying that the "Trenton Times" has nailed down the issue, and that Senator Williams has promised hearings.

1)
Lead Off...

Now, Mr. Chairman, as indicated in my prepared statement I have had the opportunity of being Chairman of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities since its inception twelve years ago. I have worked on reauthorizations for the Arts and Humanities four times during those years, as well as on the development of the initial legislation. ~~I have~~ ~~studied~~ I have studied these two programs year in and year out most closely. ^{I believe I am a} ~~I take great pride in having a reputation for fairness.~~ I believe my colleagues know that I am not a disagreeable type, or one given to rash or intemperate actions. It is normally my philosophy to look on the best side of things, rather than the reverse. It would have been far easier for me -- in terms of the time and effort we have spent, and in many ways in political terms -- to have set aside my misgivings in this case.

But this is a matter of deep importance to me. It is a matter of principle.

It is a matter ~~of~~ for serious consideration, in my view. The National Endowment for the Humanities, though a relatively small program (in comparison to others over which I have legislative oversight responsibilities as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Education) is nevertheless one which has immense potentials for improving our wisdom as a nation, our ability to compare past with present throughout the entire broad scope of the humanities, and ^{to} ~~come~~ ^{to} come to new understandings, new appreciations of values, which can improve us as individuals, and thus improve the contributions we make to each other, to our society, to our country as a whole.

This is a matter of deep concern to me. It requires a leadership that has exceptional merit. To me that is an absolutely

21
essential criterion. It requires vision and imagination and flexibility--
an openness to new ideas. I regret, Mr. Chairman, that I find these
qualities now lacking.

Dr. Berman is well aware of my views. I have discussed
them at length with him -- initially almost a year ago. The White
House and the Administration are well aware of my views. I made them
known initially in September of 1975.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, to me this is a matter of serious
concern and a matter of principle ^{and should} ~~It cannot be settled to my satisfaction~~
in any pro forma manner.

Dr. Berman has suggested in a letter to you, Mr. Chairman,
that a hearing could be scheduled which would require only a few hours
of the Committee's time and that a vote be taken ^{immediately} thereafter. In no
way do I subscribe to that point of view. And since, Mr. Chairman, Dr.

Berman knows the full measure of ^{this matter's} my concern, I might add that it appears
^{to me to be in the province of the Senate and not that of the executive branch.}
~~somewhat presumptuous to suggest a pro forma type of arrangement on~~ ~~which I would have~~

^(what kind of hearing?)
I intend to develop several areas of questioning today
which will serve to indicate the ^{depth} ~~depth~~ of my concerns and the type
of material I will need from Dr. Berman and the Humanities Endowment
in response.

~~Subsequent to the hearing~~
I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, that I had once hoped
that we could avoid this kind of confrontation, such as we have today.
I have told both Dr. Berman and the White House that I could not foresee
a happy ending to it, that it could be unhelpful to Dr. Berman personally,
and to the program which I helped establish and ^{in which I} believe, ~~in~~ In your wisdom,
Mr. Chairman, you saw clearly that the legislative process of reauthorizing
the Arts and Humanities program for the next four years, and the matter

3/
of Dr. Berman's reappointment, should be kept separate. That is certainly in the best interests of all concerned.

But now we reach the point of confrontation. I have tried very hard to prevent any escalation of this ~~issue~~ situation. I have been increasingly subjected to distortions of my own point of view. Some of these attacks have taken on a tone of ^{I would hope} unthinking viciousness; and they have grown in decibel as if a mechanical volume device was being gradually, and quite deliberately it would seem ^{being cranked} to me, being advanced. I will have some comments on ^{I have in fact in recent extremely noisy address} that later on, as recent evidence which has come to me suggests a considerable germaneness to this hearing.

I do want to stress, however, that I have not sought to advance the volume myself. In the past I have simply said that in my view Dr. Berman has done, on balance, a passable job -- that I have nothing personal against him -- but that in my view the word passable is in no way related to the word exceptional. We need the highest possible quality in the Humanities Endowment. We need exceptional leadership to achieve that goal.

We need an exceptional leadership in terms of the programs to be carried out, and in terms of the way they are administered.

I would like now to turn to a report which was prepared at my request by the General Accounting Office. It was completed last ^{February} ~~January~~ on the National Endowment for the Humanities. It resulted from a two-month study of the Endowment. In his letter of transmittal to me Comptroller General Staats pointed to a recognition which he and I shared that "because of limited time, we would not be able to provide you with a complete assessment of the overall

articles about me is in this regard

4)

effectiveness of the Endowment nor verify all the information the Endowment provided us." On the basis of this report, I ^{have} could well insisted ~~have insisted~~ on further studies in greater depth. That ^{still might} remains possible. Again, I chose not to escalate a confrontation ~~at this time~~ by seeming perhaps to use prerogatives which might be misinterpreted at the time, or to defer action on Dr. Berman, except in terms of the legislative priorities which have been mentioned.

But now, Mr. Chairman, I feel obligated to make this report public and to ask that it be included in the Record.

I would point out that the GAO report does not suggest malfeasance in office, but it does suggest ^{significant} shortcomings in administration which are of considerable concern to me. These include:

- a surprising and greatly increased lack of final reports required of grantees, with late reports running up to a year. (In this respect the report shows to me a very serious consequence that grants can be renewed for a second year without an evaluation or assessment of the first year's work -- I will come to a question on that particular aspect later on, with a specific example.)

In addition, *the report shows*

- a lack of responsible reporting from the Humanities state committees, which resulted in corrective steps in our legislation;
- a lack of fiscal accountability at the State level -- again a subject of legislative concern
- a ~~lack~~ of monitoring on expenditures made by large grantees;
- a statement that a Planning ^{November,} and Analytical Studies unit was formally established in 1975 to determine the nature and needs in the Humanities, and the impact of current NEH policies and programs on these needs. In this regard, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that November, 1975, coincides with my objections that the Humanities program was relatively lacking in national impact. I will also return to that later.

5)
But now let us take these areas up one by one:

Dr. Berman, the GAO report shows the following.

It shows that there was a routine check by the GAO of the Endowment in August, 1974 and that at that time 60 grantees were late in submitting final expenditure reports and 93 were late in submitting final narrative reports. *I repeat these numbers 60 and 93.*

The report continues: "As of December 10, 1975, 273 grantees were late in submitting final expenditure reports, of which 47 had been late over 12 months. Concerning narrative reports, 291 were late, of which 70 had been late over 12 months."

This seems to me shocking! That is a four-fold increase in these late reports in just over a year's time. It seems especially of concern when you had a GAO report in August of 1974 in which this problem was pinpointed for remedy. I can understand perhaps a tightening up process that would not eliminate this problem all at once... but, especially under the circumstances, I cannot understand at all a four-times increase. That simply seems to indicate a faulty administration.

Please comment if you will -- just on this question now. We will get to other areas later.

HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU CONSIDER THESE FINAL EXPENDITURE AND NARRATIVE REPORTS?

Are they not a real basis for a thorough and necessary and essential evaluation of the overall program?

6)

I turn to the next item regarding these late reports.

The GAO says:

"A list of grantees late in submitting reports is prepared only once a year; thus, some grantees reports may be delinquent for almost a year before NEH takes action."

(Please comment)

The GAO report further says that the Endowment funds are paid to grantees before receipt of final reports. In other words, a new grant can be made to the same grantee before the first one is evaluated.

Is that correct?

I am very concerned here about these administrative procedures relating to on-going grants. (Note: Berman may try to slide around this line of questioning by saying that the so-called shared staff is involved, or that the same practices apply to the Arts... If he does, jump on this... Say you want to fix responsibility, and that you will ask for the relative information (this alone could take a couple of weeks))... But stress that he is the head of the agency. The GAO report is about the Humanities Endowment -- not about the Arts or the shared staff. Quote again as above: "some grantees reports may be delinquent for almost a year before NEH takes action."

As I say I am very concerned about these administrative procedures relating to on-going grants -- two and three year grants, for example, to one particular group.

Under these procedures would it not be possible for a second installment of the grant to be made without, and I emphasize this point again, without receipt of a report ^{the} on/effectiveness, or lack of effectiveness of the first installment?

Now, in this regard, let me bring up your so-called "Writing in Chicago" program, about which I have inquired and about which you wrote to me on July 1.

(Note: this is a very hefty file which I have been developing)

As I understand it, this program is designed -- over a three-year span -- to enable a cultural institution, in this case a library, to become a center of formal education for its community.

I had received some criticism of this program, and your response indicated that there was a foundation for the criticism. In fact, five members of the Advisory Committee, including its Chairman, had resigned with..."the strongest possible suggestion to you that the Writing in Chicago Program not be awarded funding for its two remaining years."

Your letter to me of July 1 -- and I would ask that these various documents now be placed in the record, Mr. Chairman -- your letter to me of July 1 stated that the program involved \$282,000 -- a commitment for that sum, that \$148,000 had been paid as of the end of June. I am informed that the second year of the program is beginning.

2)

The letter from the five members of the Advisory Committee who resigned -- including the Committee chairman, I repeat -- suggested in great detail that the program was not accomplishing its intended mission. That letter is dated March 16.

In the Endowment's own response to that letter, dated April 9, the Endowment says:

"It is customary to arrange for outside evaluations of multi-year experimental programs. The proper timing for the evaluation is after the beginning of the second year, however, since only then will the evaluators be able to judge the extent to which the program has benefitted from past mistakes... Another advantage of that timing is that the comments and suggestions of the evaluators can be shared and used by the grantee and Endowment alike in shaping the third year's program."

Before you respond, Dr. Berman, I have several comments to make:

1. It would appear to me that this is an example of post-facto reporting and evaluation, and its problems with the administration of a multi-year grant.

2. It would appear that the comments of the initial advisory committee have been shelved, in favor of a post-facto procedure which is described as standard to the Endowment.

3. It would appear to me that if this program is as badly managed as has been suggested, and documented, the taxpayer is suffering from improperly used federal funds.

9)

4. I am not now trying -- today, that is -- to argue the merits or demerits of this particular case. We can do that at another time if it seems appropriate... But I am questioning, here and now, the administrative procedures involved.

Dr. Berman, the letter from the Endowment to which I have referred -- the letter to the Advisory Committee Chairman who resigned -- states that you have reviewed this matter in great detail with your staff.

Would you care to comment on this issue, and on the points I have made?

(Note: here again, is a situation -- a good one for us, I think, with a large grant involved and what appears to me an attempt at white-wash by the Endowment -- which will require time to look into. As per above, I have substantial documentation from Chicago in what appears to the resigning members of the committee a gross misuse of funds.)

10)

Now let me turn to this statement in the GAO report:

"The State-based ~~program~~ program grant proposal (that is, the application for new funding) also summarizes the prior year's activities... This summary is accepted by NEH in lieu of the normally-required final narrative report. The summary, however, is actually not a final report on prior year year's activities, because not all grant projects have been completed. NEH said no other reporting is required of the committees because their staffs have limited ~~time~~ available time for preparing reports..."

That indicates to me the practice of post-facto reporting on a broad scale, throughout your State committee program, which you have been so insistent on defending as exemplary, ~~as being a model~~. It indicates to me a slip-shod administrative process which has been going on for four years, since this program was fully initiated. It indicates that one of these State committees could be funded from year to year without detailed evaluation of its prior year's work.

hope to guarantee
How could you expect to ~~have~~ the highest quality under that kind of procedure?

(Note: he will probably say that the reauthorizing legislation corrects, or aims to correct this particular situation, even in the House bill... but you should stress that he has permitted this slip-shod procedure to develop with his people, his appointees in the States.)

11)

Mr. Chairman, I might add paranthetically, that as of February 5 we had a letter from the Deputy Chairman of the Humanities Endowment, expressing "delight" in the contents of the GAO report on the basis of what he expected it to contain. I find no similar pleasure in it.

I find it disturbing.

Let me continue:

In the available time for the GAO investigation, only two states were visited. In each case, says the report, "committee officials generally did not know the extent to which committee grantees were properly accounting for funds..." Perhaps we could improve that zero batting average if we looked at all fifty states.

Quoting further: "Since the State-based program began, NEH has audited only one committee."

How can it be said that all this is tantamount to a fully responsible administration?

Will you comment, Dr. Berman?

Now, let us look at another area of this report by GAO.

I stress again, Mr. Chairman, that I did not ask at the time, nor have I since asked, for the kind of in-depth study of this agency which could well be said to be merited -- the kind of study that lasts a year or so in keeping with thorough and fully comprehensive GAO practices.

Let me quote again from the report:

"NEH grant provisions state that the grantees must assure that the payments requested do not exceed the reasonably anticipated cash needs of the grantee/ subgrantee. Further, in the case of grants for \$100,000 or more, the amount requested may not exceed that required for a 30-day period.

"We examined 10 NEH grants awarded for over \$100,000. In almost all cases, NEH, for various monthly periods, had advanced funds to grantees in amounts exceeding the grantee's estimated monthly cash requirements," ~~thus, the availability of~~
~~not actually~~

Theoretically, Mr. Chairman, that could cause the Government to incur unnecessary interest costs for borrowings beyond actual need. If money is committed unnecessarily, before it is needed, the government suffers, and so does the taxpayer. It is certainly not a practice that inspires confidence. Nor should it be condoned.

"For example," the report goes on to state, "one grantee was advanced \$100,000 on June 23, 1975, against a total grant of \$280,000, and as of January 1, 1976, NEH's grant file indicated that the grantee has not submitted an expenditure

report nor cash request since that date. It follows, therefore, that the grantee was advanced considerably more cash than needed for a 1-month period."

I would call laxity in almost of all of these 10 large grants investigated a pretty poor batting average.

Dr. Berman, you are welcome to comment on that.

There is another matter in the GAO report that I would like to bring up today.

I have referred to it earlier. It has to do with the impact -- or lack of impact -- the Humanities Endowment is having on our country.

Let me quote, once more, from the GAO report:
It ~~says~~ points out that --

J A Planning and Analytical Studies was formerly established in November 1975 to determine ~~more systematically~~
“(1) the nature and extent of national needs in the humanities to which NEH should give attention and (2) the impact of current policies and programs on these needs.”

I would like to ask first, Dr. Berman, why the November, 1975, date for this project? Could it perhaps have resulted from statements I had been making at that particular time about the relative lack of impact on our country that the Humanities Endowment was making?

On November 12 and 13 of 1975, when we were having joint hearings with the House of Representatives on the reauthorizing legislation for the Arts and Humanities programs, I expressed my concern. It has deepened since then, as you know. But, why the November 1975 date for establishing this Planning and Analytical Studies unit?

This unit suggests to me that you really didn't know the "nature and extent of national needs in the humanities to which NEH should give attention -- and that you weren't really aware of what kind of impact you were producing across the nation."

I would like to know, for example, what kind of impact you are having on younger people. ~~Examine statistics just the other day~~ I have read statistics that show that less than 5% of our secondary school graduates intend to study in the Humanities in college. These figures I have seen were prepared by the National Humanities Faculty, which I believe receives support from the Endowment -- is that correct?

The statistics, I am informed are based on the results of a nationwide survey. The comment by the National Humanities Faculty is that these statistics are "indeed grim." I mentioned 5% -- the exact figure is 4.4%. Would you comment on that, please?

(Note: I have figures from our first Senate report (1965) showing that the 4.4% figure represents a decline... But I would let him, in this case, come up with some statistics, and reserve the ammunition for rebuttal. You could remark that it seems to you that ten years ago the humanities had more attraction for young people than they do today... Ask for figures on this, a study, some more detailed information.)

15
As you know, Dr. Berman, the impact of the Humanities program across the nation is very important to me. And it is very germane to these hearings and to an evaluation of performance.

What would you say was the impact of the Endowment's program on ethnic groups? ~~on the minorities~~

I have heard some considerable criticism in this regard.

I would like for you to supply us with some information on this subject, so that it can be evaluated.

I would like the same information with regard to minorities and the underprivileged, so it, too, can be evaluated.

And I would like to know what this belatedly started Planning and Analytical Studies unit is all about, how many people it involves, what is its cost to the taxpayer -- and again, why it was established in November, 1975, exactly coincidental with the reauthorizing hearings.

I might comment that it would seem to me that both these study areas -- planning and analysis -- should have been intrinsic to the development of the program from its start. It could be a major reason why the program has seemed to me to lack a real impact on our nation. Has this unit studied the format of the State programs in the arts and the impact they have had all across the nation. You might learn some lessons.

16)

Now I would like to turn to another subject area, and to have your comments on certain comments which have been made and rather widely circulated about me.

Lets begin with this one from a newspaper column:

It says in its headline, "Pell Tries to Politicize NEH" and it goes on to say that I advocate a program of support for the humanities ^{aimed at} ~~the~~ "putting control of state agencies in the hands of political hacks and at debasing the function of the national and state agencies."

Would you subscribe to that thought which forms the basis of this particular article, namely, that my efforts are to debase state and national programs by putting the state programs in the hands of political hacks?"

Would that seem an accurate statement of my views?

(Note -- this section will lead up to the letter Berman has written whose text as I took it down verbatim over the phone with respect to the underlined parts. It's a letter he sent to the President of the University of Chicago, for one. I've just learned one also went to Kingman Brewster at Yale... Hannah Gray has this, I have found out, but has not contacted me... I learned of this development through the Yale Press President, with whom I lunched the other day. He says Gray thinks it is so awful that she is afraid to release it, for fear of hurting the whole cause of the Humanities... But I have good reason now to believe that the letter has not just gone to to or three or four or five, that it's being widely used by Berman... I intend to develop this as per the following pages)

17)

(Note also -- I think Berman is most likely to start saying here that he disassociates himself from remarks like this in the press. If he does, he is walking into a trap... If he doesn't, he is in trouble, too...)

I would like to ask your views on some of these terms.

Lets begin with the word "politicization". You are a scholar, Dr. Berman -- how would you define that word?

(The dictionary defines it simply as to make political.)

(And the dictionary describes a politician as "one skilled in political government or administration" or ... "one who in seeking or conducting public office is more concerned to win favor or to retain power than to maintain principles...")

Note:

How would you define the word "politician?"

Do you believe that all politicians are, so to speak, "political hacks?"

Would you apply the term "politician" broadly to elective office, or to appointive office -- or to both?

(Would you say that the terms have a derogatory meaning?)
This question may not be needed.

You see, Dr. Berman, I have always been working under the

18)

apprehension that I can contribute to my fellow man by being involved in the political process. I dare say that concept holds true for members of Congress. I entered political life for that very reason.

Now, let's look at the word "politics," Dr. Berman. How would you, as a scholar define that word? Politics in the dictionary is defined as 1. the science or art of political government and 2. the practice or profession of conducting political affairs... Do you have another basic definition?

I come back now to the word "politicization" -- can we be more precise in that definition. You give it a derogatory meaning here? In other words, if someone is trying to politicize something, he is per se acting badly, acting to impede, acting to undermine... But isn't our process of government a political one?

Do we not have political parties? Do they not represent our form of government? We'd have to say yes, on both counts, wouldn't we?

Yes, as most scholars know, we have in the United States two major political parties. One is called the Democratic party, the other the Republican party.

You are not suggesting, I hope, that the whole basis of our government is wrong -- and that we should not have political parties -- or are you?

You are not suggesting, I hope, that we should eliminate all ~~politicians~~ who practice in the political process?

In sum then, if you are using the word politicization in a purely derogatory sense, and if that's what it means to you, fundamentally -- by definition -- it seems to me that you are looking at a very dark side of the picture. It might even be said you had a pessimistic view of our whole political process. I am not referring to you specifically now, Dr. Berman -- I mean anyone who held those views. And it would seem particularly unfortunate in terms of the humanities, and preciseness of definition.

Anyone who equates the political process -- at a State level or at a national level -- ^{entirely} /with political hacks doesn't seem to have a very open mind -- would you say that was true?

You wouldn't say that all governors were political hacks, would you ?

Or other State officials?

State Arts Council members -- are they political hacks?

The State Arts Councils which are deeply involved with State governments, are they sullied or debased by that involvement? State Arts Councils -- which have been responsible for a fifteen-fold increase in State funding for the arts and for establishing more than 1,000 community arts councils across the nation -- are they the work of political hacks and politicians who know nothing? Is that true?

And yet you have told us repeatedly that a federal-State partnership that involves the Humanities with State governments is

to be avoided at all costs, is wholly unacceptable. Is that because it will be dominated by venal politicians who can't understand the meaning and the fundamentals of the Humanities? That's what is implied here -- a debasement which will affect the national program as well as the State program.

I have a very basic problem, Dr. Berman, with those who suggest that our State system is run by political hacks.

Let me put it to you in another way. It seems to me that if I were in your position I would welcome the opportunity to facilitate a process which would allow the scope and wisdom of the humanities to participate directly in State governments, at all levels -- not from the outside looking in, but from the inside looking out. Your attitude seems to me to reject totally that kind of a process, that kind of a challenge, that kind of an opportunity -- and I must say it deeply disturbs me.

But now I come to another word -- to the word "professional." I would like your definition of that word, as it applies to the humanities.

Does Washington have a monopoly on that word -- or is it possible that someone out there, somewhere beyond the Patomac, or even in the Congress, might have some knowledge of what that word means when it is applied, as you have just applied it, to the Humanities?

Would you say it was possible -- I mean outside of any blanket, across-the-board denial, that someone who helped initiate this program for the Arts and Humanities twelve years ago might have some knowledge of the importance of that word to the Humanities?

Let me refer to this phrase in Section 8 (b) of Public Law 89-209, the precedent-setting legislation which created in 1965 the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. That section refers to the composition of your advisory council, the National Council on the Humanities, and I quote:

"Such members shall be selected on the basis of distinguished service and scholarship or creativity and in a manner which will provide a comprehensive representation of the views of ... professional practitioners in the humanities."

Let's be more specific. Would you say that the Senate author of that legislation containing that language had no knowledge of all that word professional implied, and its significance?

Let's be even more specific. Would you say that the individual involved as chief Senate sponsor of that legislation had some knowledge of what he was talking about, and what he intended this legislation to accomplish in respect to what we are discussing?

More than just a smattering of knowledge? I'm not seeking to extract an unwilling opinion from you. I'm merely asking for information.

Please just answer, yes or no... More than just a smattering of knowledge?

Would you go so far as to say, some considerable knowledge of the importance of professional quality in the humanities -- as I might add, for the arts, also -- because the same word, the same meaning is implicit there in sections dealing with the Arts program. I repeat -- would you ~~say~~ go so far as to say that the individual so involved with the beginnings and development of the legislation to create this program, had some considerable knowledge of the importance of professional quality in the humanities?

Just yes or no, please. We have a lot of ground to cover.

Fine. Thank you.

Now I would like to explore with you for a moment or two the word bureaucracy.

Doesn't that word essentially mean government by bureaus?

Would you say that a Washington bureau, or governmental entity is per se better than a State one?

Do you believe in a balance of power in governmental terms? We have, for instance, a legislative branch, an executive branch and a judicial branch. Is that a good system or not?

Or should we have, perhaps, just an executive branch -- and one big Washington bureaucracy, with its own decision-making process and self-interpreted rules and regulations, and laws. It

seems to me that when other nations have ventured into such forms of governmental controls we have called them dictatorships, or autocracies, or variations on that theme. We have hardly called them democracies.

Now then, there is a balance in our government ^{between} nationally, ~~between~~ the federal government and the States. I might point out that the States are not groupings of private citizens, serving the federal government. The governors of States do not and did not emanate out of some kind of Washington appointive process. So there is governmental balance in our United States -- and the States make decisions about what they -- their people -- think is best and wisest.

That philosophy seems to me to have a deep and abiding significance to our nation, to its development, to the whole democratic process.

And yet you have characterized its application to your Humanities program as "wholly unacceptable."

I ask at this point that there be included in the record a copy of a letter Dr. Berman has written to the Chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare relative to this point -- in which he characterizes the Senate legislation to reauthorize the Arts and Humanities "wholly unacceptable," with respect to the section dealing with State humanities programs.

Essentially the Senate bill gives the States-- not Washington -- the opportunity to choose which course they wish to pursue with respect to the humanities, and it also enables them to

continue presently existing programs, if they so desire. It gives them the option to choose, not the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Now let us come to still another word -- or rather two words, Dr. Berman. One is the word "grocer", the other is the word "lumberjack."

Could we have a definition of those words from you, please?

Would you say that grocers, for example, are somewhat akin to peasants, as that word used to be defined in days fortunately gone by ---- in other words, those unable to cope with the rarified areas of the humanities? Not the Elysian fields, certainly, in this case -- but the Elitist fields... Would you say that grocers ought to be excluded from the humanities? A sort of out forever -- never darken my door?

You see I happen to have great sympathy for our country's grocers, and small businessmen, and lumberjacks, who work in lonely settings -- and they symbolize for me those in our country, who like all of us, are seeking improvements, greater quality in their lives. We are all in the same boat -- those of us with a formal education, those who have not gained that education. We are all in a quest together for betterment. As you know, Dr. Berman, I am also Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education. It is my hope that my goal will eventually be achieved: a full education for all our citizens, as a matter of right.

But we have not reached that goal yet, and there are many in our country who seek for improved quality in their lives. I have always viewed the Humanities as being of assistance, as the bringers of new opportunities for appreciation. I am talking about the great variety of the Humanities, their inspirational quality. Not just in the social sciences, if you will. Not just with regard to issues of public policy. To me that limits the richness of the humanities. It limits the scope and potentials of your programs as they now exist with your State committees, who must all -- because you say so, fundamentally - subscribe to programs dealing with public policy issues.

Let's not forget the study of great literature, great poetry, philosophy.

Let's not forget that Socrates in ancient Greece did not live in an ivory tower.

Let's not forget the small groups of people from different walks of life who assembled in our own country in earlier times, and who devoted a few hours each week to learning and exploring with each other that learning process. And let's not forget that the benefits of the humanities are for all of us -- not just an exclusive few.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do not deride the grocer, or the lumberjack or anyone else in an honorable trade -- not necessarily identified with intellectual pursuits. To me they are not reasons for snide comments, or condescending attitudes, or ridicule.

And if we can reach out and give to all our people new incentives, new opportunities to expand their horizons, that to me, at any rate, is a basic mission of the Humanities Endowment -- in line with

what I intended years ago, and with what the Congress intended in my judgment. And I couldn't be more serious about all this, or take it more to heart.

I have been accused of philistinism when I talk about the Humanities at a grass roots level. Well, I happen to believe that the grass roots are where we derive a great part of our strength. And it shouldn't be the exclusive province of imaginative programs in the Arts. The grass roots are for the humanities. Would you say I was a philistine for believing that, Dr. Berman?

Would you join in the sarcasm -- and the distortions -- which I have come my way?

Would you call my attitude frivolous?

Would you call it a reason for academic laughter?

What would you say about a person who sent out a bundle of ~~all~~ these various animosities and distortions and called it an accurate case book of the Pell Affair?

And what would you say ~~to this statement~~ about a person who wrote this cryptic analysis to prestigious leaders in the academic world -- just this; And I am referring to a so-called accurate case book of the Pell Affair. Just this -- Quote: "Implicit is the attempted politicization of the agency." I pause there, just for a second to stress that word -- the whole agency, mind you. Quote again -- "Pell objects to the professional use of Endowment funds,," Let me pause again -- that's an amazing statement to me, really it is. Let's go on. "He prefers that NEH funds go to state bureaucracies -- and then be disseminated to grocers and lumberjacks

to enable them to practice (?) the Humanities."

What would you think of that, Dr. Berman? Would you call that man a great scholar, a great leader, an objective analyst? Would you give him full marks for excellence of wisdom, and breadth of vision?

Or would you call him something else? Would you say he was more snide than tall, more petty than broad in outlook?

I am waiting for your answer, Dr. Berman, for that last quotation comes from you...